

Jeff Goldberg
230 So. Carolina Ave, SE
Wash., D.C. 20003

9/1/78

Dear Jeff,

Thanks for your note, the Ray statement and the other enclosures. I found the adm. committee records for July helpful, too, thanks. If you have a copy of the assassins' comparisons of Ray's statements that also would interest me because he dropped a few things he had not told me before the committee and may have done the same thing in the committee interviews.

My problem with Ray is not that he lies. At least for the most part he doesn't. Rather is it what he doesn't say that he really should - where it is in his interest but still doesn't because he sees it otherwise. So the minute droplets that mean nothing to others are of potential importance to me.

The Post Dispatch Byers story is a dupe for me so I'm returning it, thanks. Your copy is not clear so this is as clear as any other you'll make.

There were two UPI stories, one from the Chicago Times, the other uncredited, having to do with the UPI's claim to have broken the Ray records loose under FOIA, which as you know it didn't, and a Hollywood Press 5/19/78 "Grace Walden Freed!" thing plus the other things I'm returning because they also are dupes and to make a point, and four pages that were blank except for zeroxing marks.

I presume Ray was the source of some of these things, not new to me.

The Nashville Banner 6/26/75 story that says Ray had not been out of solitary from the time of capture is false. He had it very rough but not that rough. He was never in solitary at Brushy, which was closed at the time of the story, except after two escape attempts. He had not been as restricted at the state pen from about 9/1/74 and he was in a tank with other prisoners during the evidentiary hearing in Memphis.

The stuff from Marie I published and/or we used at the evid. hrg. If Ray provided this it has much less significance than other excerpts.

The Walden story is a classic. Except for the fact that she was in the booby-hatch and under the most dubious of circumstances the falsity is as total as anything I have ever seen. People repeat Lane's fabrications without question, often inflating them. None of this means what it says, either. There was never a time after the guilty plea hearing when she could not have come out, given a place to go. I put Paul Valentine onto that in about 1972 and he did a very fine piece on it for the Post. (So much for Sherlock "one tracking her down and springing her from captivity.") Believe me, the rest is total falsity. In the finest possible detail. The regard offered was not the NAACP's, she was not part of the creation of any sketch, she was not leaned on for a statement, by the FBI or the locals, and Adams and Webster were in no way involved.

Do I have to say more about King assassination experts and expertise? Or the consequences of such "experts" being heard and printed and broadcast? Which is why I've taken this time.

I'll be in D.C. to tape a Tony Brown show on the 6th and again on the 13th and 14th for status calls in FOIA cases., in case anyone wants to check anything with me. At other times, save for short periods on local errands, I'll be home.

Hosty was a secret witness about two weeks ago. Know of any others?

While I've not given it any thought I presume the committee will regurgitate the FBI's stuff, which it has, on the crime and will do as much as it can to make the incredible Cohen/Lifton nonsense about the Rays credible. Looking toward November, if you hear anything about this I'd be interested. Except for excisions the committee has gotten, so far as I know, only what I broke loose and have read, with the exception of bad informers turned over to it. Patterson is not the only one. (I know him.)

Appreciate what you sent. The clerk's report should be out soon. When you need more \$\$ please let me know. Thanks and best,

8/31/78

Harold -

Here's the Ray
statement you wanted -
I just got back to
DC after a week away.
I'll be in touch -

Jeff